REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-54 were pending. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-54 have been rejected. By the above amendments, Claims 1, 12, 22, 31, 41, 45 and 52-54 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-54 are currently pending.

Amendments to the Claims

Each of the independent Claims 1, 12, 22, 31, 41, 45 and 52-54 has been amended to include a routing software that detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device and compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted. Support for this limitation is found throughout the specification, such as at least on page 6, lines 18-20. Accordingly, these amendments include no new matter.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 5-13, 16-23, 26-30, 41, 43, 45 and 52-54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0098379 issued to Huang (hereafter "Huang") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0022453 issued to Balog et al. (hereafter "Balog"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Huang teaches a computer program that organizes and manages media files. The computer program includes a database management system for organizing data stored locally on a computer, and a graphical user interface (GUI) for selectively accessing the organized data. [Huang, § 0025] This organization structure is nothing more than a relational database with pointers and indexes. [Huang, § 0032] The media files being managed are locally stored and accessed. In general, there is no transmitting of data from the local computer to secondary devices, such as an MP3 player or a video recorder. In particular, there is no transmitting of data based on the organization of the media files. The Huang application is specifically designed to organize and manage data locally stored in a database on the local computer on which the application is loaded. As such, Huang does not teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to

be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. As acknowledged on page 4 of the Office Action, Huang also does not teach a controller coupled to the storage device to selectively transmit the digital information based on the type to one or more secondary devices.

Balog teaches a method for delivering content to a plurality of mobile devices coupled to each other and participating in a communication network. The mobile devices interoperate via a number of radio technologies such as the IEEE 802.11 wireless specification. [Balog, § 0021] The content includes a plurality of data types and is delivered from a service provider to at least one of the mobile devices depending on the characteristics of the data and the characteristics of the device. [Balog, Abstract] Balog teaches that a user with a plurality of devices is able to define a list of preferred devices and create a mapping of the type of content that each of the devices can render. [Balog, § 0031] However, Balog does not teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. Instead, Balog briefly teaches a routing application. Specifically, Balog teaches that the content routing application of the mobility server uses user profiles to route content to the correct user, at a specified time, using the most appropriate communication protocol and path to the preferred device. [Balog, §0029] The routing application of Balog does not detect which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

In contrast to the combined teachings of Huang and Balog, the computing device of the presently claimed invention performs automatic content sorting and network routing by file type. The computing device has a central processing unit and a storage device. The storage device stores digital content downloaded from the server and a routing software application. The routing software compares the file types of the digital content with set values that determine where the digital content is routed. Specifically, the routing software utilizes a routing table that defines which type of file is associated with which secondary device. The routing software automatically detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device and selectively transmits the digital content to the appropriate secondary device(s) according to the routing table. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for automatically routing digital information. The apparatus of Claim 1 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information and a routing software to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted, and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically sort and selectively transmit the digital information based on the type to one or more secondary devices coupled to a computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Claims 5-11 are dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 5-11 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 12 is directed to an apparatus for automatically routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The apparatus of Claim 12 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information and a routing software to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted, and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically determine which type of digital information is routed to which secondary device, and selectively transmit the digital information based on the type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Claims 13 and 16-21 are dependent on the independent Claim 12. As discussed above, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 13 and 16-21 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 22 is directed towards an apparatus for automatically routing digital media content from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The apparatus of Claim 22 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital media content having a type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital media content and a routing software to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital content media is to be transmitted, and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically determine which type of media content is routed to which secondary device utilizing a routing table, and selectively transmit the digital media content based on the type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Claims 23 and 26-30 are dependent on the independent Claim 22. As discussed above, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 23 and 26-30 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 41 is directed to a method for routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices based on a routing software that compares a type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted. The method of Claim 41 comprises receiving the digital information having the type, automatically sorting the digital information based on the type, and automatically transmitting the digital information based on the type to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by a routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 41 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Claim 43 is dependent upon the independent Claim 41. As discussed above, the independent Claim 41 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 43 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 45 is directed to a method for routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The method of Claim 45 comprises receiving the digital information having a type, automatically detecting the secondary devices coupled to the computing device by a routing software that compares the type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted, automatically sorting the digital information based on the type, and automatically transmitting the digital information to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices based on the type. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 45 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

The independent Claim 52 comprises an apparatus for automatically routing digital information comprising media content of different media types including music, video and data. The apparatus of Claim 52 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a media type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information and a routing software to compare the media type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted, and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically sort and selectively transmit the digital information based on the media type to one or more secondary devices coupled to a computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 52 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

The independent Claim 53 comprises a method for routing digital information based on a routing software that compares a media type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted, the digital information comprising media content of different media types including music, video and data, from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The method of Claim 53 comprises receiving the digital information having the media type, automatically sorting the digital information based on the media type, and automatically transmitting the digital information based on the media type to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As

discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 53 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

The independent Claim 54 comprises an apparatus for automatically routing digital media content of different media types including music, video and data, from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The apparatus of Claim 54 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital media content having a media type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital media content and a routing software to compared the media type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted, and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically determine which media type of media content is routed to which secondary device utilizing a routing table, the routing table comprising a media type column and a device column and selectively transmit the digital media content based on the media type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 54 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Within the Office Action, Claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 24 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Balog and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,043,477 to Mercer et al. (hereafter "Mercer"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 3 and 4 are dependent on the independent Claim 1. Claims 14 and 15 are dependent on the independent Claim 12. Claims 24 and 25 are dependent on the independent Claim 22. As discussed above, the independent Claims 1, 12, and 22 are each allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 24, and 25 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 2, 31-34, 37, 40, 42, 46 and 51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Balog and further in view

of U.S. Patent No. 6,253,207 to Malek (hereafter "Malek"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 2 is dependent on the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 1 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. As acknowledged on page 16 of the Office Action, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a computing device coupled to the server, the server including digital information.

Malek teaches a method and apparatus for separately transporting each monomedia stream of a composite multimedia signal across a network, such as an ATM network. Malek generally teaches the transfer of packet information from one server to another. [Malek, col. 4, lines 6-27] The packets of Malek are embedded with addresses to determine the destination. Malek does not teach any apparatus or method that routes digital information to an appropriate secondary device by file type. Malek does not teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

Accordingly, neither Huang, Balog, Malek nor their combination teaches a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device.

The independent Claim 31 is directed to a network of devices for automatically routing digital information. The network of Claim 31 comprises a server including digital information and a routing software to compare a type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted, a computing device coupled to the server for obtaining and automatically transmitting the digital information based on the type, and one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software for receiving the digital information from the computing device. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog, Malek nor their combination teaches a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the

independent Claim 31 is allowable over the teachings Huang, Balog, Malek, and their combination.

Claims 32-34, 37, 40, and 51 are dependent upon the independent Claim 31. As discussed above, the independent Claim 31 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, Malek, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 32-34, 37, 40, and 51 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 42 is dependent on the independent Claim 41. Claim 46 is dependent on the independent Claim 45. As discussed above, the independent Claims 41 and 45 are both allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 42 and 46 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 35, 36, 38 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Malek and further in view of Mercer. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 35, 36, 38 and 39 are dependent on the independent Claim 31. As described above, the independent Claim 31 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, Malek, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 35, 36, 38 and 39 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 44 and 47-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0167318 to Robbin et al. (hereinafter "Robbin"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 44 is dependent on the independent Claim 41. Claim 47 is dependent on the independent Claim 45. Claim 48 is dependent on the independent Claim 1. Claim 49 is dependent on the independent Claim 12. Claim 50 is dependent on the independent Claim 22. As described above, the independent Claims 1, 12, 22, 41 and 45 are all allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 44 and 47-50 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner are encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: October 6, 2009

By: /Jonathan O. Owens/
Jonathan O. Owens
Reg. No.: 37,902
Attorneys for Applicant